



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/799,509

03/12/2004

Dennis L. Weaver

BSS0021

2370

27268 7590 05/02/2007

BAKER & DANIELS LLP
300 NORTH MERIDIAN STREET
SUITE 2700
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LUONG TRUNG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/02/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/799,509

Applicant(s)

WEAVER, DENNIS L.

Examiner

LUONG T. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 7, 11-14, 18 and 22-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6, 8-10, 15-17 and 19-21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/12/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-2, 7, 11-13, 18, 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Korling (US 4,341,452).

Regarding claim 1, Korling discloses a mounting assembly (camera mount 10, figures 1-3) for mounting a camera (camera 12, figures 1-3) to a support structure, the camera having a camera body and a lens (lens 14, figures 1-3), said assembly comprising:

a first bracket (mounting plate 34 and bracket 32, figures 1-3, column 8, lines 37- 52) being fixable relative to the camera body wherein said first bracket supports the camera;

a second bracket (inner yoke 24, figure 1-3, column 8, lines 3- 45) supportingly engaging said first bracket, said first bracket being rotatable about a first axis (axis C, figure 3, column 8, lines 3- 45) relative to said second bracket;

a third bracket (outer yoke 20, figure 1-3, column 8, lines 3- 45) supportingly engaging said second bracket, said second bracket being rotatable about a second axis (axis B, figure 3, column 8, lines 3- 45) relative to said third bracket, said first and second axes being substantially mutually perpendicular, said third bracket being supportingly securable to the support structure wherein said third bracket is rotatable about a third axis (axis A, figure 3, column 7, lines 65-67)

Art Unit: 2622

relative to the support structure, said second and third axes being substantially mutually perpendicular; and

wherein at least two of said first, second and third brackets are relatively translatable along a substantially linear length and wherein said first, second and third brackets are securable relative to said support structure whereby the camera may be fixedly mounted in a selected position (figures 1-3, column 7, line 37 – column 8, lines 45).

Regarding claim 2, Korling discloses wherein said second bracket is linearly translatable relative to said third bracket (figure 1-3).

Regarding claims 7, 18, Korling discloses wherein said third bracket is pivotally mounted to the support structure with a fastener (thread nut 44, figure 2, column 7, lines 59-67), said fastener defining said third axis.

Regarding claim 11, all the limitations are contained in claim 1, except for the limitation “surveillance camera” is also disclosed in Korling (Korling discloses camera which can be moved to different visual area, angle or position; this indicates that camera in Korling is a surveillance camera, column 1, lines 5-12, lines 33-36).

Regarding claim 12, Korling discloses wherein said first bracket is directly secured to said camera body (camera 12 is mounted on plate 34, figures 1-3).

Regarding claim 13, Korling discloses wherein said second bracket is linearly translatable relative to said third bracket (figures 1-3).

Claim 22 is a method claim of apparatus claim 1. Therefore, see claim 22 is rejected for the reason given in claim 1.

Regarding claim 23, Korling discloses wherein selecting the rotational position of the camera about the first axis comprises rotating first bracket relative to the second bracket (camera 12 rotates about the axis C, figure 3).

Regarding claim 24, Korling discloses wherein selecting the rotational position of the camera about the second axis comprises rotating the second bracket relative to the third bracket (camera 12 rotates about the axis B, figure 3).

Regarding claim 25, Korling discloses wherein selecting the rotational position of the camera about the third axis comprises rotating the third bracket relative to the support structure (camera 12 rotates about the axis A, figure 3).

Regarding claims 26, 28, Korling discloses wherein selecting the translational position of the camera comprises sliding the second bracket relative to the third bracket (the inner yoke 24 slides inside the outer yoke 20, figures 1-3).

Regarding claim 27, Korling discloses wherein selecting the rotational position of the camera about the first axis comprises rotating first bracket relative to the second bracket (camera 12 rotates about the axis C, figure 3);

wherein selecting the rotational position of the camera about the second axis comprises rotating the second bracket relative to the third bracket (camera 12 rotates about the axis B, figure 3); and

wherein selecting the rotational position of the camera about the third axis comprises rotating the third bracket relative to the support structure (camera 12 rotates about the axis A, figure 3).

Regarding claim 29, Korling disclose manufacturing the first, second and third brackets from sheet material (plate 34, bracket 32, inner yoke 24, outer yoke 20 are sheet material, figures 1-3).

3. Claims 3, 14 are rejected 103 (a) over Korling (US 4,341,452) in view of Paff et al. (US 4,833,534).

Regarding claims 3, 14, Korling fails to specifically disclose a substantially hemispherical dome, the camera being mountable within said dome, said dome being substantially transparent when viewing outwardly from a position within said dome, said dome being substantially opaque when viewed from a position external to said dome. However, Paff et al. teaches a surveillance assembly, which comprises dome-like cover 15, camera assembly 14, dome-like cover 15 is transparent when viewing from a position within the dome-like cover 15,

Art Unit: 2622

the dome-like cover is a opaque inner dome-like (figure 3, column 1, lines 40-42, column 4, lines 4-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Korling by the teaching of Paff et al. in order to prevent camera from damaged caused by weather.

4. Claim 30 is rejected 103 (a) over Korling (US 4,341,452) in view of French (US 5,735,742).

Regarding claim 30, Korling fails to specifically disclose wherein the position of the camera is selected to position a gaming table in the field of view of the camera at a desired orientation. However, French teaches a gaming table tracking system and method in a casino, in which camera 36 will be trained on at least the gaming table 19 or the portion of the gaming table which gave rise to the signal which called for surveillance (figure 1, column 6, lines 12-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device in Korling by the teaching of French in order to provide a camera for observing gaming tables in a casino. Doing so, it is particularly valuable for its ability to reduce theft and fraud on the casino floor, while also reducing the need for large numbers of employees to manually monitor activities at the various gaming tables (column 2, lines 47-55).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 4-6, 8-10, 15-17, 19-21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Tovi (US 4,225,881) discloses discrete surveillance system and method for making a component thereof.

Sergeant et al. (US 5,627,616) discloses surveillance camera system.

Schneider et al. (US 6,375,369) discloses housing for a surveillance camera.

Matko et al. (US 6,762,790) discloses universal camera bracket that allows 180 degree of pitch adjustment.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUONG T. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571) 272-7315. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, DAVID L. OMETZ can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2622

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LN
04/25/07



LUONG T. NGUYEN
PATENT EXAMINER